

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,961	07/18/2003	Ronald J. Hoffart	GROU-010	4003
7	590 05/18/2004		EXAMINER	
Michael S. Neustel			PECHHOLD, ALEXANDRA K	
Suite No. 4 2534 South Un	iversity Drive		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Fargo. ND 58103			3671	

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/622,961	HOFFART, RONALD	) J.		
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Alexandra K Pechhold	3671			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence addre	ess		
THE   - Exter after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fr , cause the application to become ABANDO	e timely filed days will be considered timely om the mailing date of this comm NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.		
Status				÷		
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 Ju	<u>ıly 2003</u> .				
2a)[	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E		• •	erits is		
Dispositi	on of Claims			•		
- 4)□	Claim(s) is/are pending in the applicatio	ın				
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
	Claim(s) <u>1-10 and 12-20</u> is/are rejected.					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.					
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r ·		•		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) 🗌	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(a)-(d) or (f).			
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		•			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	ived in this National Sta	age		
* 0	application from the International Bureau	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
3	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not recei	vea.			
			•			
Attachment	t(s)					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summa				
3) M Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/19/03</u> .	Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	Date al Patent Application (PTO-15)	52)		

Art Unit: 3671

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-10 and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frisbee (US 4,405,019).

Regarding claims 1 and 14, Frisbee discloses an implement mounting system comprising:

- a support frame (seen as arms 20 and 22)
- a ball joint attached to the support frame (viewed as trunnion mounting 56)
- a support arm (seen as cylinder 50) having a first end and second end, wherein
  the first end is attached to the ball joint and wherein the second end receives an
  attachment structure for an implement (as shown in Fig. 2), and
- a brace member (seen as link 66) attached between the support frame and the support arm, wherein the brace member has an angle with respect tot the support arm for reducing side-to-side movement of the support arm (illustrated in Figs. 1 and 2).

Frisbee fails to disclose specifically a ball joint, instead disclosing a trunnion

Art Unit: 3671

mounting (56) (seen in Figs. 1 and 2). Yet Frisbee does disclose that the that the cylinder (50) is suitably secured within a trunnion mounting (56) mounted to frame (12) such that it has complete freedom of movement in any direction (Col 4, lines 58-61). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the trunnion mounting of Frisbee to be a ball joint, since both connections allow for complete freedom of movement, therefore providing the same function and would be interchangeable in achieving the same purpose.

Regarding claims 2 and 15, Frisbee fails to disclose specifically a ball-and-socket-structure, instead disclosing a trunnion mounting (56) (seen in Figs. 1 and 2). Yet Frisbee does disclose that the that the cylinder (50) is suitably secured within a trunnion mounting (56) mounted to frame (12) such that it has complete freedom of movement in any direction (Col 4, lines 58-61). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the trunnion mounting of Frisbee to be a ball joint, since both connections allow for complete freedom of movement, therefore providing the same function and would be interchangeable in achieving the same purpose.

Regarding claims 3, 4, 16, and 17, from Fig. 1 of Frisbee the angle between the cylinder (50) and link (66) appears to be about 75 degrees. Frisbee fails to disclose the particular angular degree between the components. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the angle between the cylinder (50) and link (66) of Frisbee to be less than 75 degrees and greater than 10 degrees, or less than 55 degrees and greater than 10 degrees, since

Art Unit: 3671

both ranges appear to be close to that illustrated by Frisbee in Fig. 1, and furthermore, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Regarding claims 5, 6, and 18, Frisbee discloses in column 5, lines 5-12 that the link (66) is pivotally connected by a ball and socket joint to bracket (68) and to bracket (70).

Regarding claims 7 and 19, the link (66) is attached to a cross member, seen as bar (76) in Figs. 1 and 2, which is attached transversely to the cylinder (50).

Regarding claims 8 and 20, bar (76) receives a pair of vertical actuators, seen as (72) and (74) in Figs. 1 and 2.

Regarding claim 9, the link (66) is attached near a distal end of the torsion bar (76).

Regarding claim 10, Fig. 1 illustrates the distal end of bar (76) being on an opposite side of the cylinder (50) of where the link (66) is attached to the support frame (20, 22).

Regarding claim 12, the link (66) can be viewed as attached to a rear support of the support frame (20, 22) in Fig. 1, if that portion where it is attached is termed a rear support.

Regarding claim 13, the link (66) is attached to a side of the arm (20), and thereby can be viewed as being attached to a side support of the support frame.

Art Unit: 3671

## Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claim 11 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexandra Pechhold whose telephone number is (703) 305-0870. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs. from 8:00am to 5:30pm and alternating Fridays from 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas B. Will, can be reached on (703)308-3870. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

AKP 5/11/04